

Officers on Rs. 200 and above appointed in Travancore service from outside.

136 *MR. K. A. MATHEW: Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing:

(a) the names of officers drawing Rs. 200 and above appointed in Travancore service from outside the State from the year 1112 onwards;

(b) their qualifications and age;

(c) the names of such of those officers as had been retired from other States or Provinces; and

(d) how many of them are covenanted officers?

*RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: (a) to (d) The time and labour involved in collecting the required information are out of proportion to its possible utility.

Demands for grants—(contd.)

**DEMAND IV—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION EXCLUDING
FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT, ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S
OFFICE, LEGISLATIVE BODIES AND LOCAL FUND
AUDIT DEPARTMENT.—(contd.)**

Motion No. 4.—(contd.)

PRESIDENT: Before I call upon Mr. Sankara Pillai to continue his observations, I may say that what he has stated yesterday has been considered by Government. Government are greatly indebted to the honourable member for the serious grievance that he has brought to the notice of Government. Orders have been passed that every lock-up in the State should be provided with a latrine before the end of 1120.

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI (Thiruvalla): I thank the Government for the assurance. In addition to providing latrines and lavatories in every lock-up, my submission is that orders may be immediately issued so that persons in the lock-ups should not be taken along the roads and asked to case themselves on the roads and thus cause nuisance to the travelling public. It is nuisance not only to others but to their own morality and their own sense of responsibility. In the light of the assurance given by the Chair I do not press my motion.

The motion, by leave of the House, was withdrawn.

Motion No. 5.

MR. VARKALA K. MADHAVAN:

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

(To urge the necessity of lifting the ban on tapioca powdering).

MR. VARKALA K. MADHAVAN: Though I do not want to move the motion standing against my name, I want to bring to the notice of Government that it is only during the war period that the industry has got any chance of development. Government should consider that aspect of the matter.

Motions Nos. 6 to 10.

PRESIDENT : Before I call upon Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai, I may make a statement. There are 4 or 5 cut motions by members belonging to the State Congress party.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI :

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

(To discuss the statement of the Dewan re : the Travancore State Congress.)

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI :

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. XAVIER VINCENT :

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

(To discuss about the policy of the administration in general.)

MR. V. I. IBICULLA :

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Rs. 5.

(To discuss about the policy of the administration in general.)

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI :

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Rs. 5.

(To discuss the administrative policy of the Government in general.)

Regarding the motion of Mr. Nataraja Pillai "To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,75,832 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1" because the object of the motion is not mentioned, it is out of order. Others are taken motions to discuss the administrative policy of the Government. The rule on that matter has been stated thus :—

It is a well known practice that token motions or substantial motions involving a review of the general administrative policy of the Government may or may not, at the discretion of the Government, be taken as motions for a vote of want of confidence on the Government. Having regard to what has happened, Government have decided to regard these motions as motions for the vote of want of confidence in the Government, and the procedure regarding the ordinary motions for the vote of want of confidence in the Government will be valid for the motions now tabled. I shall call upon the honourable members who have to move that vote of want of confidence and they will be answered by other honourable members, if they choose to intervene and later by members of the Government. A vote will be taken at the end of that motion and the whole House will be at liberty to vote. This is therefore treated as a motion for a vote of want of confidence in the Government.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : Sir, to begin with, I may state that the motion which I intend to move is not intended as a no-confidence motion. I made it clear the other day that I must get a fair opportunity to discuss the statement made by you as the Dewan-President.

MR. A. K. BHASKAR (*Quilon cum Kottarakara*): May I know which of the statements the honourable member is referring to? There are many statements made by the Dewan-President.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: If the honourable member had exercised a bit of patience he would have understood what I really meant by the Dewan-President's statement. I mean the statement made by you, Sir, on the second of this month; the statement in reply to the alleged interference of government officials in respect of the elections to the legislature.

PRESIDENT: It comes to this. In regard to the alleged interference, Government said that subordinate officials have repudiated any charge of interference. Government have made themselves responsible for certain statements about certain allegations which had no evidence on the one side or the other; but if the policy adopted by Government is wrong, honourable members are at perfect liberty to move a vote of want of confidence. Whether the honourable member says it is for a vote of want of confidence or not—on a matter of that fundamental importance, *viz.*, the liberty of elections—honourable members have to put forward their theory that the Government have not pursued an even tenor. Then, it is definitely a charge of wrong doing; in other words, the motion is one for the vote of want of confidence in the Government.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I want to make my position once more clear. I want only one matter to be discussed and nothing more, and that alone was meant by me. In other words, I want the statement made by you as Dewan to be discussed. You made certain allegations against the State Congress, in respect of the allegations made by the State Congress that Government officials interfered in the matter of the recent elections. I want to meet that point. I want to place before the House certain material points regarding the charges levelled against the State Congress. In passing a vote of confidence or no-confidence, what I wish to bring to the notice of the House is that more materials than now in possession of the members of the House are necessary. That will be made clear in the course of my remarks. That being the case, to pass a motion for recording confidence or no-confidence in the Government, more materials must be placed before the House than I am prepared today. In respect of my motion I will make my position clear. There are allegations on the one side and denials on the other side. To offer a fair criticism, there must be full materials before the House. We say that there was interference by Government officials in the recent elections. No doubt, Government would say that there is no interference. Then an impartial tribunal must be set up to enquire into the matter.

PRESIDENT: I fully realise the cogency and the relevancy of the honourable member's observations. The honourable member's case in fact is that the State Congress is putting forward one group of allegations and the Government are putting forward another group of allegations. The public are at a loss to choose between the veracity

[President.]

of one statement and the other and therefore a public enquiry is needed. From the time of the receipt of the letter from Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai, the President of the State Congress, when he made the allegations, till today, I think that that was the case of the State Congress and Government have decided not to have a public enquiry. That is definite. Therefore the honourable member may proceed with his further observations on the basis that the Government have decidedly negatived the idea of a public enquiry, and therefore if the Government are at fault in having negatived a public enquiry, if the Government have not fulfilled their duty, by turning aside the request made by the State Congress, honourable members are at perfect liberty to attack Government on that basis.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Mine is not a motion of no-confidence on the Government. In order to discuss that question I will have to place more materials than the materials I am prepared to place before the House by reason of the motion which I have placed before the House. That being the case, so far as my motion is concerned, I will confine myself to one matter and no other.....

PRESIDENT: As a matter of fact, all these token motions can be taken together. In other words the motions of Messrs. T. K. Narayana Pillai, Nataraja Pillai, Xavier Vincent, Idiculla and Chellappan Pillai for discussing the administrative policy can be taken together. By that, certain honourable members will be discussing one aspect of the matter. They are at perfect liberty to do so. Other honourable members will put forward any other aspect of the matter that may occur to them and a vote of want of confidence in the Government will be taken after all these motions are disposed of.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: As I understand the constitution, there is no point in putting forward and carrying a vote of no-confidence so long as there is not a removable executive. A no-confidence motion has its legal effect when there is a removable executive.

PRESIDENT: The honourable member apparently has not been paying much attention to the proceedings of the central Legislative Assembly which I was reading. I have been in the central Legislative Assembly myself and I have had a motion for want of confidence moved against me when I was the leader of the House. That will be seen from the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly. Another vote of want of confidence against the Government was moved when I was the leader of the Council of State. That can also be seen from the proceedings of the Council of State. A removable executive is effectively dealt with by a vote of want of confidence because on the passing of the vote of want of confidence the executive resigns, but even in the case of an irremovable executive as in the case of the American Legislature and as in the case of the Indian Legislature, a vote of want of confidence means that the people do not consider that Government are doing their duty. That is the meaning of the vote of want of confidence in an ir-removable executive.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Then I take it that this House has jurisdiction to pass a vote of no-confidence on the executive.

PRESIDENT: Only in this way; that is, a vote cannot be directed by a motion that the Dewan be removed. That will be irrelevant. In fact I go further and say that all appointments above Rs. 500 are not even votable. It is not open to this House to say that the Chief Secretary, The Excise Commissioner, Mr. Salter, or Mr. Ure be removed from office. That will be out of order. But to move that the policy of the Government is wrong as indicated in the Indian Legislature can be done by a token cut in the General Administration Budget. That is the only occasion on which an opinion about Government policy would be possible. In no other budget item can, what may be called the general opinion of the House as to the policy of the Government be given. It is only on the General Administration Budget and that by a token cut that it may be done.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I will now proceed with the subject matter under discussion. You made a statement in reply to certain allegations about the interference of Government officials in the recent elections against certain members set up by members belonging to my party. By those allegations we wanted to elicit an answer from the Government whether Government officials have interfered in the elections as against the candidates set up by the State Congress.

The reply given by the Chief Secretary to Government was that there was no interference. You will remember that that was the very first statement that you made on the opening day of this Assembly in this new year. We the members of the State Congress, expected from you, Sir, the soft words which would turn away wrath. But instead, we found words which were to a very great extent wounding to our self-respect. You made very serious charges against the State Congress, and we may honestly confess before you Sir, that we were stunned and stupefied at that statement. We were really not prepared for that statement.

Now, I proceed to consider the various aspects of that statement. Your statement, as well as the reply given by the Chief Secretary, must be read together. What does that indicate? You said in your statement that the State Congress was an organisation whose activities led to mob violence in 1933, 1940 and 1941. Further, you say that the State Congress is an organisation which is setting up labour and student movements so as to create unrest in this country, and thirdly you said that you have made this view of the Government clear to the officials so that even if they have interfered in the matter of elections, there would be justification for such interference.

PRESIDENT: It is not correct. What I said was that the officials were forbidden to interfere in the elections. But it would not be correct to say that the attitude of the Government—which naturally would be reflected to a certain extent in the attitude of the officials—would be to say that the State Congress as a body is guilty of what I have

[President.]

indicated. At the same time, the honourable members will realise that I proceeded further in that statement to say that notwithstanding this opinion of Government, Government were convinced that there was a body of people in Travancore who held those opinions and were members of the State Congress, and that the Government wanted their opinion to be represented on the floor of the House. This matter was also equally made obvious, and was communicated to the officers. That is the position.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Now, Sir, if your statement did really mean to say—I have no other reason to assume otherwise—that in spite of the fact that the attitude of the Government was made known to the officials and in spite of the fact that you have given strict instructions to the officials not to interfere in the elections, there was some interference unwittingly on the part of officials, it would have been no grievance to us. But my point is this. I understand that statement to mean that even if the Government officials did interfere, it was a matter for which they were not to be blamed but that you as the Head of the Administration would take the responsibility upon yourself.

PRESIDENT: No. I deny that with great respect. I no doubt took upon myself the responsibility. The responsibility which I assumed is the responsibility for those two views, on the attitude of the State Congress. The first is that the State Congress was in the opinion of Government—this opinion is borne out by the materials before them and is not capricious—primarily responsible for acts of violence and sabotage. I may, in this connection, say that the year 1939 will have to be carried back to one more year, namely 1938. And so the Government were convinced of the fact that the State Congress incited the students, and collaborated with certain subversive leaders of the labour movement—a collaboration which I wish again to say continues today. At the same time I said that the Government were nevertheless anxious that the State Congress should be adequately represented on the floor of this House. This is the second view. If officers have not understood both those statements and have misconceived the intentions of Government the honourable member is at perfect liberty to point out such instances.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I was trying to analyze the statement, Sir, which you made on the second of this month. I submit that in the first place you said that the State Congress was responsible for the disturbances of 1939, 1940 and 1941. The question is whether there were alleged disturbances for which the State Congress was directly or indirectly responsible. The second question is, granting for a moment that there were such disturbances, is it a matter for consideration at this stage and in this Assembly? Is it a matter on which a statement should be made to us? Is it a matter on which a warning should be given to us especially on the day when the Session opened?

As a matter of fact, there were allegations on the one side and denials on the other. The Government said that there were disturbances and those disturbances originated from the State Congress. The State Congress denied it and repeatedly asked for enquiry on the matter. Till now, there has been no enquiry and the matter rests where it was. Even granting for a moment that there were disturbances and they had indirect connection with the State Congress, is it a matter for contemplation now, in the year 1944? Three years have elapsed since those alleged occurrences took place and is it a matter for contemplation at this stage?

MR. K. A. MATHEW: May I know from the honourable member whether the Government withdraw the case against those who were alleged to have been connected with the State Congress in Chengannur?

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I shall deal with it. There was a serious charge against a large number of people before the Sessions Court, Quilon, and the case has since been withdrawn. The allegations were that they indulged in many illegalities such as breaking open locks, damaging culverts and bridges, preventing people from entering the town, etc., which proved to be unfounded.

What I wish to urge is: Is it a matter for contemplation at this stage? The State Congress has a constitution of its own. The State Congress has got a written constitution. It has got a Working Committee called the "All Travancore State Congress Committee." Has it ever been proved that the disturbances to which reference has been made were connected with the members of the Committee?

Now, Sir, you referred to the Indian National Congress. What is the attitude of the British Government towards the Indian National Congress? What is it that we find in British India? In the year 1921 Mahatma Gandhi made the following statement in respect of the activities of his own followers at one stage. I will read that portion. "I have said times without number that a Satyagrahi admits no violence, no pillage, no incendiarism. Still, in the name of a Satyagrahi, you burn down buildings, extort money, stop trains, cut telegraph wires, kill innocent people and plunder shops and private houses." That was what Mahatma Gandhi said. And in the following year, 1924, we found his followers entering the Central Assembly and the Provincial Assemblies. Pandit Motilal Nehru and a group of followers entered the Assembly and you, Sir, cannot be unaware of their activities, very useful activities, in the Central Assembly in 1924 and onwards.

Simply because that some insignificant members of the State Congress, some unimportant members of the State Congress, some years past, were connected with violence, is it right that we, the present members of the State Congress, should be condemned? Is it the reason that we would not behave with any sense of responsibility? My submission, therefore, is that the reason given for condemning the State Congress—the first reason given for condemning the State Congress—cannot stand scrutiny.

[Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai.]

I would then submit before this House that in the year 1930, Mahatma Gandhi declared his Civil Disobedience Movement, and the movement lasted for one year. In the year 1935, we found Congressmen, who were guided by Mahatma Gandhi entering the Legislatures all over British India and forming Ministries. In eight out of the eleven provinces they formed their own ministries and they were treated as trusted Ministers. But what were they doing in 1922 and 1930 and in the years that preceded? In 1921, Mahatma Gandhi started his non-co-operation movement. What was the avowed object? It was to mend or end the British Government in India. He called the Government 'satanic'. Nevertheless, in 1935, we found the Congressmen forming ministries. My point is that by the activities of a few violently-minded followers of an organisation, the whole organisation cannot lose its integrity. If, Sir, there were disturbances in Kadakkal or in some other place, the whole organisation cannot be condemned. An organisation like ours cannot be indicted on that ground. Therefore my submission is that the first point in your statement about condemning our organisation cannot bear scrutiny.

The second point is that we were inciting the student and the labour population in the State in order to create unrest. In the first place, the statement has never been accepted by us. We have repudiated that time and again. Labour has its own organisation in the State. The students too have their own organisation. We have never interfered with those organisations. It is not our object to enter into the activities of their organisations. But, if the students and the labourers sympathise with the State Congress and join us, can it be our fault? Can the waters of a river flow anywhere else except towards the great Ocean? And therefore I ask: Is it a wonder when the student and the labour population which form the most progressive elements in the State sympathise with and join the only political organisation in the State? My submission therefore, is that the second point urged by you in order to condemn our organisation cannot also stand scrutiny.

The third point is in fact the most important point, viz., the interference in elections. If there was any interference in the election as a matter of fact, there was much - was there any moral or legal justification for it? As I submitted before, there are very definite and clear allegations as regards the Government interference in the elections. But I shall not complain about what happened in my own constituency, not because I have no grievance, but I do not want to make any complaint about anybody. I am prepared to suffer without making any complaint. I have been insulted. I have been subjected to all sorts of humiliations. Nevertheless, I do not complain because I am not one of those who believe on punishments at the hands of an earthly tribunal. I leave it to higher powers than man.

Sir, I humbly submit that there is a deep felt grievance throughout the country about what took place in this city of Trivandrum. About the nature of the complaint and what it means, I will do well to explain it by quoting a letter which the President of the State Congress sent to you, Sir, and it has been placed on the table under your direction. This is what Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai says :

" It is with regret that I address you on the present state of affairs in the city consequent on the conduct of Government Officials in relation to the coming election to the Sri Mulam Assembly. Officers such as "Mr. K. G. Kunja Krishna Pillai, the Legal Remembrancer, Mr. Oosman the local D. S. P., Mr. Sankaranarayana Iyer the city A. S. P., Mr. Oomen the Cantonment Inspector of Police, Mr. Chandrasekharan Nair the Corporation Commissioner, Mr. Sankara Menon, Welfare Officer and a host of other officers of the Excise, Police, Education and other Government Departments are freely and openly canvassing support for Mr. C. S. Lekshmana Aiyar the candidate opposing the State Congress Candidate Mr. K. Gopala Pillai. These officers openly declare that Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar is really the Government's candidate and that any body who votes for Mr. Gopala Pillai will be found out and severely dealt with by Government. Departmental heads, it is said, have instructed their subordinates to vote for Mr. C. S. Lekshmana Aiyar. The Director of Public Instruction and the Excise Commissioner are prominently mentioned in this connection. An Assistant School Inspector by name Mr. K. Thanu Pillai is said to have visited even the High Schools of the city with a voters' list and taken signatures of teacher voters, compelling them to vote for Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar. The officers have succeeded in instilling in their subordinates the fear that if they did not vote for Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar, they would lose their jobs. The fear is also widespread that trouble would befall any one who does not vote for the "Government Candidate". The Chief Secretary himself is said to have exerted his influence in favour of Mr. C. S. Lekshmana Aiyar. The officers go to the extent of telling people that Government will, after the election, violate the sanctity of the secret ballot, scrutinise the ballot papers, find out those voters that did not support Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar, dismiss such of them that are in service and otherwise harm others. The wonder is that they do not realise that the propaganda brings Government into great contempt.....".

Well, Sir, these are "very serious allegations.

PRESIDENT : The honourable member having read that letter, according to ordinary rules of debate, he would be doing well if he reads the reply also.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : Yes, Sir.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI : Since my name has been mentioned, I may be given an opportunity to make a reply.

PRESIDENT : That shall be done.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : In fairness, I must read that letter. The reply is :

"Your letter of the 6th instant contains serious allegations against many officials of the State to whom I shall communicate its contents though it is difficult for me to believe that they will contravene the instructions of Government or would try to influence the elections. (Of course, you will realise that Mr. K. G. Kunjukrishna Pillai is a part-time employee of Government and is not an official in the usually accepted meaning of the term.) That the Government have taken a neutral attitude must be evident from the fact that, for instance, your wife and the wife of the Trivandrum candidate Mr. Gopala Pillai

[Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai.]

are both Government servants notwithstanding your attitude and the attitude of the State Congress towards this Government and towards the Head of the Administration. You may also remember that during the period of elections, complaints such as those outlined in your letter are very common. (This does not mean that they will be ignored.)

For example, reports of alleged talks by you with several persons have reached me, and in some cases from the very persons to whom you have spoken. Among such complaints are ; (a) that when approaching certain Nairs (whose names have been given to me) you have asked them to vote for the Nair candidate so as to preserve Nair self-respect ; (b) that Mr. Gopala Pillai is only a name lender in this election and that he will resign so as to enable you to stand for election as soon as practicable. I have not myself paid any credence to such rumours....."

MR. K. A. MATHEW : Sir, in this connection may I know whether Mr. K. G. Kunjukrishna Pillai is a part time officer of Government ?

PRESIDENT : Of course, yes.

MR. K. A. MATHEW : Then, may I know how he is nominated to this House as an official member ?

PRESIDENT : The position of a person who is either a part time or full time official is that he can sit on the official bench. The Advocate General is a part time official and having occupied the position of Advocate General and having sat on the official bench, having nevertheless voted against the Government of the day in the Hindu Religious Endowment Bill, I quite see that the position of part time officials of Government is peculiar. The honourable members may be aware that there are certain members who are not asked to give up their practice but who are given certain official positions. The Advocate General, Government Pleaders in certain jurisdictions, the Attorney General in England are all in this position. The matter will be made clear by the circumstance which I referred to. As the Advocate General of Madras, I differed from the Government of the time being with regard to the Religious Endowment Bill. I was sitting on the official bench. I took the permission of Government to vote against the measure. The honourable members who may see the report of the proceedings of the Legislature on the Bill will find that an official member voted against Government on an official bill.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : Now, Sir, therefore these allegations are very serious and very definite allegations have been made. It was alleged by the Chief Secretary the other day that.....

MR. E. G. SALTER : Sir, the honourable member made mention of certain heads of departments and said that they interfered in the elections. I take the strongest objection to that suggestion for this reason.

PRESIDENT : This is not the time to defend. Let the member finish his speech. Having regard to the importance of the subject and the position of Mr. Narayana Pillai as the leader of the party, I have given him some considerable time and perhaps as much time as he wanted. So, he would try to finish soon.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : Now, in reply to the letter of the Dewan, the State Congress working committee passed a resolution. It was also forwarded to Government. It will be in the fitness of things if I am allowed to read that resolution also for the information of the House. This is the resolution :

"This joint meeting of the working committee and the Parliamentary Board considered the correspondence that passed between the President of the State Congress and the Dewan on the question of official interference in the Trivandrum city election in the Sri Mulam Assembly, and the nature and extent of such interference in the various constituencies in which State Congress candidates contested. It is clear that Government officers threw their weight against State Congress candidates almost everywhere. In the city of Trivandrum interference by Government officials in the election went so far that it appeared that the State Congress was being opposed by a Government candidate. Even though the Dewan wrote to the President on 7-7-1944 that the attitude of Government was neutral, interference by Government officers continually increased in volume and intensity till the polling was over. Government officers in the city, as a rule, interested themselves in favour of Mr. C. S. Lekshmana Aiyar, many of them going out canvassing support for him. The Police, Revenue, Excise, Corporation and other staff made house to house canvassing and distributed Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar's cards among the voters and on the polling day took voters to the polling stations. The officers created among voters the wide-spread fear that the Government would scrutinise the ballot papers, dismiss Government servants who or whose relatives did not vote for Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar and otherwise effectively harm others who did not do so. They even threatened that ration card would be cancelled as a penalty for not voting for Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar. Officials such as the Chief Secretary are said to have ordered their subordinates to go out and do canvassing. It was universally recognised that Mr. C. S. Lekshmana Aiyar was the Government candidate and the Government were bent on sending him returned. High officers are said to have promised jobs to so many non-officials and secured their support. On the polling day the cars of some Government officials were used for taking voters for Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar and a large number of taxis were also used for that purpose. While all this was being done, the police had effectively prevented taxi cars and even jutkas from being available for the use of State Congress workers. Mr. K. G. Kunjukrishna Pillai, the legal Remembrancer whom the Dewan characterises as only a part time employee of Government and who was openly canvassing support for Mr. Lekshmana Aiyar, went round the polling stations and gave directions to the polling officers so that polling might take place as much in Lekshmana Aiyar's favour as possible. To these polling officers he said that voting could very well be done in the direct presence of such officers, evidently with a view to securing the vote in his candidate's favour. False personation was allowed to take place with the help of Corporation employees who were the identifying officers, so much so that even the Mayor of the City was personated and when he went to the polling station to vote he had to tender his vote. This widespread interference by officials calls for an open and impartial enquiry and this meeting requests Government to be pleased to institute one."

So, my submission is this.

MR. M. L. JANARDHANA PILLAI : The reply to that may also be read.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : Yes, Sir. It is fair I read that also. It reads :

"I have just received your letter of 5-12-1119/20-7-1944 communicating resolution passed at the joint meeting of the Working Committee and the Parliamentary Board of the Travancore State Congress."

[Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai.]

I am enclosing a copy of my letter to you dated the 7th July 1944 and a copy of the Government Circular on the subject. If, as stated in your letter, there have been infractions of these directions and instructions, the only course contemplated by the law is to proceed under Rule 31 of the Electoral Rules which lays down that "Save as provided in Rule 24 or 24A, no election shall be called in question except by an election petition presented in accordance with the provisions of Part VI of the Electoral Rules". The rules also prescribe the time limit for election petitions and the procedure in respect of them.

As a lawyer, you will, no doubt, realise that such an enquiry as is asked for would not only be against the letter and spirit of the above provision but may gravely prejudice the result of any election petition. It is hardly necessary to point out that if, after investigation and enquiry, Government should come to the conclusion that the allegations are not borne out by the facts, the conduct of the election petition may be gravely prejudiced.

In these circumstances, Government can only await the results of any election petition that may be filed and cannot, in the nature of things, comply with your request."

Now, Sir, it is clear from this correspondence that very serious allegations are made and the Government reply is that there was no interference. Even if there was, it would be proper that it must be enquired into by an election tribunal. Now, Sir, two questions arise. In the matter of election petition, the validity of the election is contested. It may be that nobody is prepared to contest for the election. As such if Mr. Lekshmana Iyer or any body else is here, does not matter. It may well be that there may be nobody here. Whatever that be, nevertheless, there is the conduct of the officials which is so seriously alleged in this complaint. It is a matter which must certainly be enquired into. Otherwise, it would reflect on the conduct of the administration and the period of the administration.

PRESIDENT: Order, order. As the honourable member has already read the last paragraph, he would have realised that what the Government said was this, and nothing more or less than this. If an election has been canvassed, a certain exclusive and primary legal procedure is prescribed for putting it right. It is not possible for Government to embark upon an enquiry into the general character of the elections so long as there is the possibility and the great chance of an election petition being filed. The honourable member will no doubt realise that the time for filing has not yet elapsed. Even now there is time for filing that petition.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Sir, I quite see the point, but my submission is this. What the State Congress leader wanted was that the officials were interfering in the election from day to day and it must be enquired into. Sir, we are not so much interested in the result of the election as in the conduct of the officials. If that were true, it would go to show that there was no such thing as the rule of law existing in the State. The rules are very clear in that the officials shall not interfere in any manner, directly or indirectly. Those rules are

based on reason and commonsense. These rules are scrupulously observed in England where we see the people glorying in their democratic institutions. In that matter there is a definite rule of law.

PRESIDENT : If the honourable member had seen the elections for the County of Derby in England, perhaps the member would revise his opinion.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : Even if it is true... ..

PRESIDENT : I do not say this in justification. I was just saying that even in the home of liberty, there is room for allegations against the conduct of elections. This very matter of election for the County of Derby came up and it was pointed out that 18 people controlled the election of 110 members of Parliament.

MR. K. A. MATHEW : But is that not an exception rather than the rule?

PRESIDENT : I am not justifying anything. I am only stating that it should not be taken for granted that in England there is no room for allegations against elections. The allegations may be untrue or may be true.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : Any way, if such a check had been made in British India, it is clear that the National Congress would never have been able to be returned in such large numbers as they have actually been returned and enabled to form ministries in eight out of eleven Provinces. I say, therefore, these complaints, according to the allegations contained in them, make it clear that the rule of law has been violated in this country. The right of franchise in this respect, has been infringed and there is practically no safety for a self-respecting citizen in the country. These are very grave allegations to maintain, and Sir, it is only in the fitness of things that a proper enquiry is made and the result announced to the public at large. And this correspondence reveals that the Government is not prepared to make such enquiries. The Chief Secretary stated that an enquiry was made into the allegations, but he also admitted that it was done behind the back of the complainants. That shows that there is involved in this an infringement of the moral codes of decorum. It is almost as if the man has been condemned behind his back.

And when all is said and done, the matter resolves itself into this. Was there any justification, legal or moral... ..

PRESIDENT : I know that I have interrupted the honourable member more than once. Nevertheless the fact remains that the honourable member has spoken for 32 minutes. The honourable member will be given five minutes more.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : Yes, Sir.

When all is said and done, the matter comes to this. You made an allegation against us on the very opening day of the New Year. Was there any justification to make that statement. The statement,

[Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai]

when analysed, comes to this: you 11 members of this House cannot be treated with the consideration.....

PRESIDENT: With very great respect, No. I want that to be made absolutely clear. So long as any honourable member sits here in this house, as a representative of his constituency, he is entitled to as much consideration and honour as any other member either a Government officer or anybody else. It would be in the highest degree derogatory to the position of Government and contradictory to fundamental principles to treat honourable members, so long as they are here as members of the Legislature, otherwise than with the utmost consideration and respect. That is very different from saying that outside this house, they represent, and in the opinion of Government, unfortunately represent, a body as to whom Government have a certain opinion. That opinion has reference to the conduct of the political body as such political body. It is taken for granted that honourable members, speaking within the house, will speak as representatives of their constituencies fearlessly and freely and be entitled to equal treatment with every other member.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Sir, the point that I was trying to develop is this. There was no justification for the statement that you made. What, after all, was the occasion for making that statement? Certain interpellations were put up for answering. Sir, I ask is it not our inherent right to put questions? The questions may be unpleasant, the questions may be unreasonable, the questions may even be malicious; but have we not the right to put malicious questions, if we wanted?

PRESIDENT: That is why they were not disallowed. But I can say thus much; malicious questions, insinuating questions should not be put.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I do not challenge that. But they can be overruled.

PRESIDENT: And also the supplementary statements on the questions.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: My submission is that the matter will rest there.

PRESIDENT: The question is, if there is a right on one side to put malicious questions, is there not a right on the other side not to give malicious but strong and emphatic answers. The answer is Yes.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: If malicious questions are put, they are not placed before the house. But certain questions were placed before the house and your statement arose out of those questions. It is clear from the fact that these questions were placed before the house, that they were not malicious. Have we not the right to put inconvenient, and unpleasant questions? Is that not a right inherent in us?

Sir, on the New Year's day, instead of welcoming us, instead of offering us some soft words, you turned on us in wrath.

PRESIDENT: I am not sure. I did not certainly give a stock answer to the honourable members. I offered co-operation to every member. That offer still stands.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Now therefore my submission is that the statement that was made was unjustifiable. It was unjust to the organisation which we represent.

And what, after all is our organisation? This organisation began five years ago in response to a resolution passed by the Haripura Congress Session. The Indian National Congress, which claimed to represent the whole of India, thought fit not to interfere with the affairs of the Native States. They said that the Native States must form their body to.....

PRESIDENT: The honourable member has exceeded his time. The honourable member has spoken for 36 minutes already.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: The Haripura Congress passed a resolution and stated that the Native States must develop their own institutions. Is it not, Sir, quite in the fitness of things that this State should also try to set up its own institution?

PRESIDENT: The honourable member may have half a minute more.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I stop, Sir.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: Sir, the other day I was painfully following your words. When emotions are up.....

PRESIDENT: I want to make the position clear. I am calling upon all these honourable members, Messrs T. K. Narayana Pillai, Nataraja Pillai, Xavier Vincent, Idiculla, and Chellappan Pillai who have given notice of their motions to speak in respect of the policy of the administration in general. The honourable member, therefore, need not confine himself to this question of elections.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI: When emotions are up, passion and prejudice cloud our vision. Sir, we are debating a proposition and of course, the function of this house is to debate too. That presupposes the fact that we approach the question to argue it logically and reasonably. Let us not forget that.

We are now considering the opinion that was expressed here by the head of the administration about the State Congress. I claim to be a member of that organisation. The opinion expressed was that the organisation indulged and indulges in subversive activities. If there is conviction behind that, if there are irrefutable proofs to substantiate it, we should not be here debating but should be defending ourselves before a Court of Law or sitting in the spacious jails. We should have been the companions of the convicts there and not the colleagues of the head of the administration here. As long as that was not done and as long as we are allowed to be here, I am forced to think and say that the Government have not the courage of conviction to hold an open enquiry and to prove the charges that have been made.

[Mr. P. S. Nataraja Pillai]

Then, Sir, the unfortunate incidents that took place in 1941 and 42 are attributed to the propaganda carried on by the State Congress. The spasmodic, isolated acts of violence on the part of a mob cannot, reasonably be attributed to an organisation unless there are irrefutable evidence to prove that the organisation actively engaged itself in such propaganda. On the other hand, the State Congress as such, even from those days, has repeatedly asked for an open impartial enquiry into the causes of those unfortunate incidents, but Government have not so far held an open enquiry and it can only mean that there are no evidence to prove the suspicion. Personalities are imported, prejudices begin to function and charges are made. Viewed from this standpoint it is, to use the mildest language, unfair to us and unfair to the minister in whom His Highness has placed his trust.

These accusations do not and will not carry us anywhere but to futilities.

Now, may I, with your permission, bring to the notice of this house, one other relevant fact. That irrepressible Indian national...

PRESIDENT : I take it that the honourable member is addressing the house only with the aid of notes. The honourable member is not entitled to read from a manuscript.

MR. P. S. NATARAJA PILLAI : I am using only notes.

That irrepressible Indian national aspiration, personified in the Indian National Congress, cannot be confined to the other side of the Ghats and naturally the consequence was the cry for responsible Government here. The Haripura Congress decision on Native States gave birth to Travancore State Congress.

In every political movement there are and bound to be phases which are dictated by changing circumstances and environments. But the objective of the movement persists and if it is good, it is bound to thrive in spite of set backs on its way.

Sir, the State Congress stands for a clear objective,—for responsible Government—and with the good will of the people it is bound to succeed in the long run. It is the common lot of political workers and political organisations to be classed as anti Government agitators and anti-Government organisations. But, Sir, we have also known of persons who were considered dangerous to carry on propaganda on the free English soil and turned back at Malta being invited to represent the Empire at Geneva. We have known of persons convicted for sedition being received by His Majesty the King-Emperor. We have also heard of rebels of yesterday becoming ministers of the Crown to-day. Let not passion and prejudice cloud our reason and vision and mislead us. May I ask you Sir not to forget facts of history.

We were dubbed as the three tailors of the Tooty street by an eloquent honourable member of this house. I have neither the capacity nor the mind to reply him in his words. I will be doing an injustice to myself if I do so. But may I in all humility invite your notice

to the fact that in a correct analysis of the composition of this house, you will find these benches representing more than one third of the population. One third of the population may be to one who thinks that he represents the whole state and population, the famous tailors of that famous street, but I respectfully beg this-house to take note of the implications of that fact.

The State Congress was considered by the Head of the Administration as subversive and anti Government in its outlook. And it was said that fact was not kept secret from the public and the Government servants. What is the implication? Sir, I from my personal knowledge, can charge the Government servants with active interference during the recent elections. I do so with a sense of responsibility. In the light of the statement of the Dewan I refrain from mentioning the names of the officers since the Head of the Administration has taken up the responsibility for that. (*President's Bell.*) I leave it at that.

MR. XAVIER VINCENT (*Ambalapuzha cum St.ortuloi*): സർ, ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട പ്രസിഡൻറ് അവർക്കും കഴിഞ്ഞ ഭരണവസം പരയുകയുണ്ടായി പൈതൃകമായ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് മന്ത്രിമാർക്കുമാണ് തൊഴിലാളികളെ ഞാൻ ആദ്യകാലങ്ങളിൽ വിക്ഷിപ്തിയെന്നതെന്ന്. അതിനു വിപരീതമായ ഒരു നാൾ അല്ലെങ്കിലും തൊഴിലാളികൾ അഭയമില്ലായ്മയിൽ എങ്ങനെയാണ് സ്റ്റേറ്റ് മന്ത്രിന് വിധേയമാകാത്തതെന്ന് എനിക്കു മനസ്സിലാകുന്നില്ല. ഈ അടുത്ത അവസരത്തിൽ നടന്ന ഇലക്ഷൻ സംരംഭങ്ങളിൽ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് മന്ത്രിമാർ പ്രത്യേകമായും, പരോക്ഷമായും സഹായിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതാണ് അവരുടെ കററുമങ്കിൽ ഞാൻ അഭയമില്ലായ്മയിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരുന്നവർ പോകുന്ന ഒരു സംഗതി മററൊന്നുമല്ല, സ്റ്റേറ്റ് മന്ത്രിമാർ പ്രത്യേകമായും വിശദമായി വിളിച്ചു പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ളത് തൊഴിലാളികൾക്കു കർഷകർക്കും വേണ്ടി ആ സംഘടന എന്നും നിലകൊള്ളുമെന്നാണ്. കാൺഗ്രസ്സിന്റെ ഈ അഭിപ്രായം തൊഴിലാളികളും കർഷകരും കേട്ടെങ്കിൽ, അഥവാ കേട്ടത് തെറ്റാണെങ്കിൽ അതിന് കാൺഗ്രസ്സും തൊഴിലാളിസംഘടനകളും തെറ്റുകാരായി പോകുന്നതു എങ്ങനെയാണെന്ന് മനസ്സിലാകുന്നില്ല. സർ, തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ഏറ്റവും രാഷ്ട്രീയ പ്രബലതയുള്ള ഒരു ജനവിഭാഗത്തെ ഉൾക്കൊള്ളുന്ന സംഘടനകളാണ് തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ തൊഴിലാളിസംഘടനകൾ. സുസ്ഥിരമായ നേതൃത്വത്തിൽ വ്യവസായപരോപമനത്തിൽ ഏൽക്കുകയും പ്രദർശിപ്പിച്ചുകൊണ്ട് മുന്നോട്ട് പോയ്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന

[Mr. Xavier Vincent]

തൊഴിലാളിസംഘടനകളോട് അവിടുന്ന് എടുക്കുമെന്നു തെങ്ങരം യോഗ്യപ്പെടുന്ന നയം ഭയമായി മാറണമെന്ന് അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു. സർ, തൊഴിലാളി സംഘടനകൾക്ക് ഈ സഭയിൽ പ്രതിനിധ്യം അനുവദിച്ചുകൊടുക്കണമെന്ന് പല പ്രാവശ്യവും സംഘടനകൾ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുണ്ട്. എന്നാൽ അഖിലതീരുവിതാങ്കൂർ ഭേദം യൂണിയൻ ഓൺഗ്രസ്സിനു ചീഫ്സെക്രട്ടറി അവർകൾ അയച്ച ഭരണത്തിൽപ്രസ്താവിക്കയുണ്ടായി മി. വാൻസൻറും, പി. കെ. കുഞ്ഞും നിങ്ങൾക്കു ഉണ്ടല്ലോ എന്നു. സർ, വിൻസൻറും, പി. കെ. കുഞ്ഞും തൊഴിലാളികളും മുതലാളിമാരും ഉൾപ്പെട്ട പലതാല്പര്യങ്ങളും ഉൾക്കൊള്ളുന്ന ഒരു നിയോജകമണ്ഡലത്തിൽ നിന്നും തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുള്ളവരാണ്.

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN: മി. പി. കെ. കുഞ്ഞ് തൊഴിലാളിസംഘടനയിൽ ഒരുഗമാണെന്ന് ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർക്കറിയാമോ?

MR. XAVIER VINCENT: തെങ്ങരം രണ്ടുപേരും തൊഴിലാളിസംഘടനയിൽ മെമ്പർ അല്ല.

MR. G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI (Umbalappuzha cum Shertalai): മി. പി. കെ. കുഞ്ഞ് ഏതെങ്കിലും തൊഴിലാളി സംഘടനയിൽ പ്രസിഡൻറായി ഇരുന്നിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. XAVIER VINCENT: ഇരുന്നിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നാണു എന്റെ വിശ്വാസം. പക്ഷെ, റിവിഡതാല്പര്യങ്ങൾ ഉൾക്കൊള്ളുന്ന നിയോജകമണ്ഡലങ്ങളിൽ നിന്നും തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുള്ള തെങ്ങര തൊഴിലാളികളുടെ പ്രത്യേക താല്പര്യങ്ങളുടെ സംരക്ഷണത്തിനായിട്ട് ഗവണ്മെൻറിൽനിന്നും നിയുക്തമാക്കിയതിൽ സന്തോഷിക്കുന്നു, എങ്കിലും തൊഴിലാളികൾക്ക് പ്രത്യേകം അചരിൽ ഉൾപ്പെട്ടവരെതന്നെ തിരഞ്ഞെടുത്തു നാമിനേറു ചെയ്ത പ്രാതിനിധ്യം കൊടുക്കണമെന്ന് ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി വാദിക്കുകയും, ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെ ഭയാഭൂതി അതിലേക്ക് പതിയണമെന്ന് അപേക്ഷിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു.

തീരുവിതാങ്കൂറിലെ ബഹുഭൂരിപക്ഷം ജനങ്ങൾ തീരുവിതാങ്കൂറിനെ ഭണ്ഡാഗാരത്തെ നിറയ്ക്കുന്നതായിട്ട് ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ഫിനാൻഷ്യൽസെക്രട്ടറി കഴിഞ്ഞദിവസം ഇവിടെ ഒരു സ്റ്റേറ്റുമെൻറിൽ പറഞ്ഞതു് നമുക്ക് അറിയാവുന്നതാണ്. തൊഴിലാളികൾ ഇപ്പോൾ കൂലി കൂടുതൽ കിട്ടുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് ധാരാളം കള്ളുകടിക്കുന്നു എന്ന്. ജീവിതം

വശ്യങ്ങളുടെ വിവരമനുസരിച്ച് നാണയവശം ശതമാനം വർദ്ധിപ്പിച്ചുള്ള ഈ അവസരത്തിൽ തൊഴിലാളികൾക്ക് ൨൦ ശതമാനം വാർഷികവർഷം മാത്രമാണ് കൂടുതൽകിട്ടുന്നത്. അല്ലാതെ അവരുടെ അടിസ്ഥാന ക്രമീകരണത്തിൽ യാതൊരു ഭേദഗതിയും ഉണ്ടായിട്ടില്ലെന്ന് അറിയിച്ചു കൊള്ളുന്നു. സർ, ഞാൻ ഒന്നുകൂടി ചോദിക്കുന്നു, എനിക്ക്, മി. പി. കെ. കണ്ണൻ തൊഴിലാളി സംഘടനകളെ പ്രതിനിധീകരിക്കാൻ പ്രത്യേകകാരുതമുള്ളതുകൊണ്ട്, എന്ന് ഗവണ്മെന്റ് പറഞ്ഞതനുസരിച്ച്, തൊഴിലാളികൾക്ക് നാമിനേഷൻ കൊടുത്തില്ലെങ്കിൽ, മി. വ. ഗംഗാധരൻനായർ മലയാളരാജ്യത്തിന്റെ എഡിറ്റർ ആയിരിക്കെ മലയാളരാജ്യത്തിന് മറ്റൊരു നാമിനേഷൻകൂടി കൊടുത്തത് എന്തിനാണെന്ന്. ഈ നയം അവരോട് കാണിക്കുന്നത് തൊഴിലാളികൾ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് കാൺഗ്രസ്സ് കാരോടു കാണിച്ചു. സഹകരണമനോഭാവംകൊണ്ടാണെങ്കിൽ ഞങ്ങൾ അങ്ങയുടെ ഓർഡറിന് പാലപ്പെട്ട ഈ മുകൾക്കുളളതോട് കാണിക്കാൻ അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു.

ഞാൻ ഒരു മിന്നിട്ടുകൂടി സംസാരിച്ചുകൊള്ളട്ടേ. കഴിഞ്ഞദിവസങ്ങളിൽ ആലുവയിൽ നടന്ന ഒരു ഭാരണമായ സംഭവത്തെപ്പറ്റി തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ പത്രവായിക്കുന്നവരെല്ലാം അറിഞ്ഞിരിക്കുമെന്ന് വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു. ഏതാനും ചില തൊഴിലാളിസമോദനങ്ങൾ കൂടുതൽ കൂടി ആവശ്യപ്പെടുകയും മാനേജരോട് ന്യായവാദം ചെയ്യുകയും ചെയ്തതിന് ആലുവ പോളിവാർക്സിഡെ മാനേജർ അവരിൽ ചിലരെ ഭേദമാപദ്രവമേല്പിക്കുകയുണ്ടായി. അതിനെ പ്രതിഷേധിച്ച് അവിടെത്തെ തൊഴിലാളികൾ ഒരു സ്ക്വെക്കുനടത്തി. എന്നാൽ വിശാല മനസ്കരും ഗവണ്മെന്റിനോട് വളരെ യോജിച്ചു പ്രവർത്തനം നടത്തണമെന്ന് ആഗ്രഹിക്കുന്നവരുമായ തൊഴിലാളി നേതാക്കന്മാർ അവിടെ യാതൊരു ശല്യവുമുണ്ടാക്കാതെ തൊഴിലാളികൾ ജോലിതുടർന്നുകൊണ്ടു പോകുന്നതിന് വേണ്ടതു ചെയ്യുകയാണുണ്ടായത്.

PRESIDENT : Your time is up. Mr. V. I. Idicula.

MR. V. I. IDICULA (*Pattanamthitta*): സർ, മന്ത്രി-ൽ ആണെന്നു തോന്നുന്നു ഞാൻ ഒരുദിവസം ചെങ്ങന്നൂരിൽകൂടി കടന്നുപോകുമ്പോൾ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് കാൺഗ്രസിന്റെ നേതാക്കന്മാർ, അതായതു തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ഏതാനും സ്വദേശാഭിമാനികളായ പൗരരത്നങ്ങൾ, ഒരു മീറ്റിംഗു നടത്തുന്നതു കാണുകയുണ്ടായി. അവിടെ ചെങ്ങന്നൂരിലും തിരുവല്ലയിലും ഉള്ള ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ എല്ലാവരും ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നു. ഒരു വലിയസംഘം പോലീസുദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരും റിസർവ് പോലീസും അവിടെ ഫാജറുണ്ടായിരുന്നു.

[Mr. V. I. Idicula]

മീറിംഗിനുള്ള സമയമായി. നേതാക്കന്മാർ പ്ലാറ്റ്ഫോമത്തിൽ കയറിക്കഴിഞ്ഞപ്പോൾ പോലീസുകാരുടെ മേൽനോട്ടത്തിൽ ഏതാനും ചട്ടവിമാർ പ്ലാറ്റ്ഫോമത്തിൽ ചാടി കയറുകയും അവരെ അപമാനിക്കാനും ഭേദമാപദവമേൽപ്പിക്കാനും ശ്രമിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നതായി കണ്ടു. ഇതെല്ലാം കണ്ടപ്പോൾ നമ്മുടെ ഗവണ്മെന്റുജോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ കൊള്ളാവുന്ന നേതാക്കന്മാരോടു ഇപ്രകാരമെല്ലാം പ്രവർത്തിക്കുന്നല്ലോ എന്നു എനിക്കു അതിയായ കണ്ഠിതമുണ്ടായി. ഈ ഒരു സംഭവമാണ് എന്നെ സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസിൽ ഒരംഗമായി ചേരുന്നതിനു പ്രേരിപ്പിച്ചത്. സർ, അങ്ങുപറയുന്ന സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസുകാർ വിചാപംസകരാണെന്ന്. ഈ സംഭവം ഏന്താണ് തെളിയിക്കുന്നത്. സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസുകാരുടെ ഏക ലക്ഷ്യം മഹാരാജാവു തിരുമനസിലെ പരമാധികാരത്തിൽ കീഴിൽ അതവാദിത്വഭരണം സമ്പാദിക്കുക എന്നുള്ളതാണല്ലോ. തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസുകാർ മറു് ആരെയുംകാൾ രാജഭക്തിയിൽ ടൂം പിന്നോക്കമാല്ലെന്നു പറഞ്ഞുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI: സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസ് പ്രതിനിധികളെക്കുറിച്ചു ജനറൽഡിസ്കഷനുള്ള അവസരമല്ല ഇതെന്നു ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർ വിചാരിക്കുന്നുണ്ടോ?

MR. V. I. IDICULA : സർ, ഞങ്ങൾ എന്തെങ്കിലും സംസാരിക്കുമ്പോൾ വ്യക്തിപരമായ വിദ്വേഷംകൊണ്ടാണ് സംസാരിക്കുന്നതെന്നു ഇവിടെ പല ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർമാരും പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. ഞങ്ങൾ ഈ രേതത്തിലെ മഹാശയനായ ഒരാളെ ഭാരതാംബുക്ക് അഭിമാനം കൊള്ളാവുന്ന രാജ്യക്കുറിച്ചു തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ദിവൻപദം അലങ്കരിക്കുന്ന ഒരു മഹാനുഭാവനെക്കുറിച്ചു ഞങ്ങൾക്കു എങ്ങിനെയൊന്നു വ്യക്തിപരമായ വിദ്വേഷം ഉണ്ടാകുന്നത്. എന്നാൽ വ്യക്തിപരമായ വിദ്വേഷം കൊണ്ടല്ല ഒരാൾക്കെതിരെ വേണ്ടിയാണ് ഞങ്ങൾ വാദിക്കുന്നത്. അല്ലാതെ വ്യക്തിപരമായവിദ്വേഷം ഇവിടെ നടമാടുന്നില്ല.

സർ, അവിടത്തെ കീഴിലുള്ള ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥവൃന്ദം സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസ് പാർട്ടിയോടു ഒരു ചിറ്റാമ്മനയം അനുവർത്തിക്കുന്നതായി എനിക്കു തോന്നുന്നു. ഇതു തിരുവിതാംകൂറിന്റെ ഒരു നിർഭാഗ്യമെന്നേ ഞാൻ കരുതുന്നുള്ളൂ. അവിടുന്നു ഞങ്ങളു വിഭജിച്ച് ഭരിക്കയാണോ എന്ന് എനിക്കു സംശയം തോന്നുന്നു.

ഏതോ ഒരു നിഗൂഢശക്തി സമുദായസംഘടനകളെ സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺ ഗ്രസിക്കുന്നതിനായി ഇളക്കിവിടുന്നുണ്ടെന്നാണു ഞാൻ വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നത്. ഏതായാലും തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ ശോഭനമായ ഒരു ഭാവി എല്ലാവരും യോജിച്ചു പ്രവർത്തിച്ചാൽ ഉണ്ടാകുമെന്നു ഞാൻ പരിപൂർണ്ണമായി വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: Sir, before proceeding I may just request your permission to club together the two motions and I may be given double the time.

PRESIDENT: You have got only one motion. Your motion regarding the raising of the minimum pay of Government servants cannot be taken up along with this. It is not a motion of no-confidence. You have got only five minutes. But if I find that you have got much more to say, I shall give you two minutes more.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: Sir, we have been called the representatives of marauders, incendiaries and felons; practically in effect. I certainly am very sorry at the unwarranted suggestion that has been made on the floor of this house by the Dewan President on the second day of its sitting. Sir, this is certainly wrong. We are the representatives of an organisation which stands and works under the principle of no-violence as enunciated by Mahatma Gandhi. I am one who watched with a critical eye the working of the State Congress and it was after I was convinced that it was going to work on a non-violent basis that I joined it. That has been made quite clear to me and I have borne the brunt of all troubles on that account. Therefore I can say that it is a sound and non-violent organisation and there is no use in suggesting that it is now an association of criminals and felons. There have been statements by honourable members that we have come here to cast vilification on you. Sir, we repudiate the statement. We come here for the service of the country. The State Congress has a constitution of its own and we are decided to work in terms of that constitution. Now Sir, your opinion about the State Congress is unfounded. Facts have been hidden from you which should never have been done. They have not reflected the opinion in the country. They have reflected only their own opinion that we are here to vilify you. But they are not representing the opinion of the country. If you go from one part of the country to the other you will see the strength of opinion in our favour. There is no use in the dogs barking. The caravan will go on. I do not, by that, mean any malicious insinuation against anybody. I was just quoting a passage from the late Viceroy.

MR. M. K. NILAKANTAN: ചെല്ലപ്പൻപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർ സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺ ഗ്രസിക്കു എതിരായിട്ട് ഡപ്യൂട്ടേഷൻ പോയിട്ടുണ്ടോ ?

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: I have not gone on any deputation against the State Congress.

MR. P. K. KUNJU (*Anbapuzha cum Shertalai*): ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മെമ്പർ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് കൗൺസിലിൽ പ്രതിനിധിയായി വാർഡാവിൽ പോയിട്ടുണ്ടോ ?

PRESIDENT: Honourable members must realise that when the honourable member was on his legs he wanted some more time and I have promised to give him two minutes more. So a better plan would be to allow him to finish his speech and then put him questions. Mr. Chellappan Pillai will finish soon. He has got 3 minutes more.

MR. P. K. KUNJU: Am I not expected to get an answer to my question ?

PRESIDENT: The answer may be got afterwards.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: Every Government rests for its stability on public opinion and if public opinion is not brought to the notice of the persons who rule the country, certainly it will be injurious to the general body politic. Therefore it is those members who said that we are here to vilify the Dewan that do not represent true facts. They do not represent their constituencies. On the other hand they were not doing what they really ought to have done. Every Government is carried on not by laws, not by violence, but by public opinion. It stands good even from the days when Sri Rama gave up his wife for the cause of obeying public opinion. Even today it stands and it cannot be repudiated. We have come to represent public opinion in the country. It is not our intention to vilify any member of this House including the Dewan President or any official, for that matter. In the light of these facts I am going to criticise the Government for some of its policies.

PRESIDENT: The time for the honourable member is over.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla*): Sir, I oppose the cut motion. I have been anxiously watching the attitude and the trend of discussion of some of the members belonging to the State Congress party and it is my firm conviction that this sort of persistent attempts on their part to avail themselves of all possibilities to attack the Government are not only based on solid and real grounds but also actuated by some ulterior motives. I can boldly assure you, Sir, that the people of this country will ever remember with feelings of pride, gratitude and satisfaction the meritorious services you have been rendering all along.

PRESIDENT: My services do not come within the purview of this debate. The whole question is whether there is reason for want of confidence in the Government.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: That is what I am coming to. There must be some cogent and adequate reason for me to express my opinion whether we have confidence in the present administration or not. You have been rendering meritorious service all these years for the industrial, agricultural and economic advancement of this country and we are all aware of the consequent prosperity of the subjects, of

course under the fostering care and guidance of His Highness the Maharaja. We are also aware of the marvellous progress the State has made during the last one decade.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: May I request the honourable member to speak a little louder.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: We are all aware that the marvellous progress the State has made during the last decade is due entirely to your administrative ability, wise statesmanship and unceasing efforts and I am sure that any malicious attempts to belittle the importance or usefulness of your glorious administration will be of no avail so far as the people of this country are concerned. The very high opinion recorded by those in authority and by very distinguished visitors will bear ample testimony to the far reaching and beneficial results of your patriotic achievements.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Can the member quote any instance?

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: According to me almost all the distinguished visitors including Mahatma Gandhi have expressed their unequivocal opinion with regard to the facts I have just now mentioned.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: May I have the pleasure of hearing at least one or two instances.

PRESIDENT: I would strongly deprecate that. What Mahatma Gandhi has stated can be known from Mahatma Gandhi's writings and what other people have said have been published and they can be known from those publications. So, I do not think any quotations are necessary.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: With regard to the complaints regarding the official interference in the recent election in the Trivandrum City Mr. C. S. Lekshmana Iyer has already explained his position and it is for the official Bench to refute the allegations levelled against Government. Under these circumstances it is my pleasant duty to express on behalf of my party and also on behalf of the Nair Service Society that the public of this country have absolute confidence in the present administration of the State. As there is very little time for me to dwell upon the details, I do not wish to do so just at present. With these observations I stoutly oppose the motion with all the force at my command and request the honourable members to vote against this frivolous, malicious and unacceptable motion.

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN : സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസ്സുപാർട്ടി നേതാവും, അതിലെ ചില അംഗങ്ങളും കൂടി അകത്തും പുറത്തുമുള്ള ആലോചനയ്ക്കു രേഖകൾ കൊണ്ടുവന്നിരിക്കുന്ന ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപം അതർഹിക്കുന്ന അവധാനതയോടുകൂടി ഞാൻ ആലോചിച്ചുനോക്കി. ഗവണ്മെൻറു ചെയ്ത അപഥസഞ്ചാരമെന്താണെന്ന് ആരോപണങ്ങളെ ആസ്പദമാക്കി ഞാൻ നോക്കി. ആരോപണങ്ങളുടെ ആകെത്തുക ഗവണ്മെൻറു തെരഞ്ഞെടുപ്പുകാര്യങ്ങളിൽ കൈകടത്തിയെന്നാണ്. ഇക്കാര്യത്തിൽ എനിക്കുള്ള

[Mr. K. R. Narayanan]

അനുഭവവും, അനുഭവമനുസരിച്ചുള്ള അനുമാനങ്ങളും, പ്രസ്താവിക്കുന്നതിനു മുമ്പ്, ചില പ്രബലസമുദായങ്ങളെ ഏതോ നിഗ്രഡശക്തി സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസ്സിനെതിരായി, തിരിച്ചുവിടുന്നുവെന്നുള്ള സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസ്സു പാർട്ടിയുടെ പ്രസ്താവനയ്ക്ക് ഒരു മറുപടി പറയേണ്ടത് അപരിത്യാജ്യമായ ആവശ്യമായി വന്നിരിക്കുന്നു. കാൺഗ്രസ്സുകാർ നിഗ്രഡശക്തിയെന്നു ഒളിവിൽ പറഞ്ഞു. ഒളിവിൽ വച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന പൗരവർഗ്ഗസ്സു ഏതു മായിക്കൊള്ളട്ടെ. പ്രബലസമുദായങ്ങളെന്നു വിവക്ഷിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത് ഇവിടെ ഒരു പാർട്ടിയായി നിന്ന് കാൺഗ്രസ്സിനോട് പല കാര്യങ്ങളിലും യോജിക്കാത്ത, എസ്. എൻ. ഡി. പി., എൻ. എസ്. എസ്. കൂട്ടുകെട്ടിനെ ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചാണെന്നുള്ളതു വ്യക്തമാകുന്നു. ഈ സംഘടനകളുടെ ഉജ്ജ്വലമായ ഭൂതകാലചരിത്രം അറിയാവുന്നവരാരും, ഈ സമുദായങ്ങൾ നിഗ്രഡശക്തികളുടെ നീർച്ചാലുകളിൽക്കൂടി ഒഴുകി സത്യധർമ്മാദികളെ എത്രക്കുവാൻ സന്നദ്ധരായി നില്ക്കുമെന്നു വിശ്വസിക്കുകയില്ല.

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI : എസ്. എൻ. ഡി. പി. യോഗം സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസിന് അനുകൂലമായി നിശ്ചയം പാസ്സാക്കിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN : യോഗം നിശ്ചയം പാസ്സാക്കിട്ടില്ല. യോഗം ബോർഡ് സ്വാഗതം ചെയ്യുന്ന ഒരു നിശ്ചയം പാസ്സാക്കിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതുതന്നെ കാൺഗ്രസ്സ് നിയമലംഘനം തുടങ്ങുന്നതിനു മുമ്പാണ്. കാൺഗ്രസ്സ് നിയമലംഘനം തുടങ്ങിയതിനു ശേഷം കൂടിയ പൊതുയോഗം, യോഗവും കാൺഗ്രസ്സുമായി യാതൊരു ബന്ധവും ഇല്ലെന്നും കാൺഗ്രസ്സു വക്കീൽ കമ്മററിയിലെ അംഗങ്ങൾ യോഗം ബോർഡിൽ അംഗങ്ങളായിരിക്കുവാൻ പാടില്ലെന്നും നിശ്ചയം പാസ്സാക്കിട്ടുണ്ട്.

MR. V. I. IDICULA : മെമ്പർ സ്ഥാനാർത്ഥിയായി നിൽക്കുവാൻ യോഗം ബോർഡിൽ അപേക്ഷ കൊടുക്കുകയും യോഗം അതു നിരസിക്കുകയും ചെയ്തിട്ടില്ലേ?

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN : ഈ ചോദ്യം ഈ പ്രശ്നത്തിനു തികച്ചും അസംഗതമാകുന്നു. എന്റെ സ്റ്റേഫിതൻ മി. ഇടിക്കളയ്ക്ക് അതറിയുവാൻ ഒരഭിനിവേശം കാണുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് അക്കാര്യം സംഗ്രഹമായി മാത്രം പറയാം. യോഗം ബോർഡിൽ ഞാൻ അപേക്ഷ കൊടുത്തിരുന്നതു ശരിയാണ്. നിരസിച്ചുവെന്നുള്ളതു ശരിയല്ല. ഒരു ചെറിയ ന്യൂനപക്ഷം വോട്ടോടുകൂടി ഞാൻ പരാജിതനാവുകയാണു ചെയ്തത്. എന്നെക്കാൾ

സ്വാധീനശക്തിയുള്ള ഒരാൾ യോഗം സ്ഥാനാത്മിയായി വന്നതോ, ഞാൻ ഏഴ് കൊല്ലം മെമ്പറായി കഴിച്ചതുകൊണ്ട് മറ്റുള്ള ഒരാളിനു ഒരവസരം കൊടുക്കണമെന്ന് ബോർഡ് കരുതിയതുകൊണ്ടോ, ഇങ്ങിനെ സംഭവിച്ചിരിക്കാം. അല്ലെങ്കിൽ ബോർഡ് തെറ്റുചെയ്തിരിക്കാം. ബോർഡിന്റെ ഈ തെറ്റു സമ്മതിച്ചാൽതന്നെ മി. ഇടിക്കളയ്ക്ക് എന്തൊരു മെച്ചമാണു വാദഗതിയിൽ കിട്ടുന്നത്. ജനകീയഭരണസമ്പ്രദായപ്രകാരം നോക്കിയാൽ ബോർഡിന്റെ തെറ്റത്തെപ്പറ്റി, ഞാനും കൂടി ഉൾപ്പെട്ടു നടത്തിയ തെറ്റത്തെപ്പറ്റിയാണ്. അതിൽ തെറ്റുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ എന്റേയും കൂടി തെറ്റാണ്. ഏനിക്ക് വളരെക്കാലം ശീതളമായ തന്ന യോഗത്തിന്റെ കമ്പ്, ഇരിക്കുന്ന മരം മുറിക്കുന്ന ബുദ്ധി കേടുപോലെ, പരിശുദ്ധിക്കുവാനോ മുറിക്കുവാനോ, ഞാൻ അഭിലഷിക്കുന്നില്ല. ഈ ചോദ്യംകൊണ്ട് എന്നെ ഇക്കിളിയെപ്പോലെ, യോഗം കാൺഗ്രസിനെതിരായി ഏതോ നിഗൂഢശക്തിയുടെ മൂക്കുകയറിൽപെട്ടുപോകുന്നുവെന്നു പറഞ്ഞുവാനാണ് ലക്ഷ്യമെങ്കിൽ, അതു തികച്ചും അസ്ഥാനത്തായിപ്പോയെന്ന് എന്നെക്കുറിച്ചുള്ള പരിചയക്കുറവ് ഒന്നുമാത്രമായിരിക്കാം ഇങ്ങിനെ ഒരു ചോദ്യത്തിനിടയാക്കിയതെന്നും ഞാൻ വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു. ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപംവഴി ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെമേൽ കൊണ്ടുവന്നിരിക്കുന്ന ആരോപണങ്ങളുടെ സംഗ്രഹം ഗവണ്മെൻറു തെറ്റത്തെപ്പറ്റുകാളുകളിൽ ഉൾപ്പെടുത്തുന്നില്ല. തിരുവനന്തപുരം പട്ടണത്തിലെ തിരുത്തൽപ്പറ്റകാളുകളിൽ എനിക്കു നേരിട്ടറിവൊന്നുമില്ല. വൈക്കത്തു് ഒരു സ്ഥലത്തു് ഞാൻ ഏജൻറായി നിന്നു. അവിടത്തെ പ്രിസൈഡിംഗ് ഓഫീസർ കാൺഗ്രസ്സ് സ്ഥാനാത്മി ആരാണെന്നുകൂടി നിശ്ചയമില്ലായിരുന്നുവെന്ന് എനിക്കു സൂക്ഷ്മമായി അറിയാം. എന്റെ അയൽ താലൂക്കുകളിലും ഗവണ്മെൻറു യാതൊരു കൈകടത്തലും ചെയ്യാതെ അഭികാമ്യമായ നിഷ്പക്ഷത പാലിച്ചിരുന്നു. രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ ഒരു ഭാഗത്തു് ഈ വിഷയത്തിൽ ഒരു നയവും, മറൊരു ഭാഗത്തു് മറൊരു നയവും, ഗവണ്മെൻറുക്കുമെന്നു ന്യായമായി വിചാരിക്കുവാൻ കഴിയുന്നില്ല. ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു തിരുത്തൽപ്പറ്റിൽ ഉൾപ്പെടുവാൻ സൗകര്യം, പട്ടണങ്ങളിലെക്കാരും ഗ്രാമങ്ങളിലാണ്. മോഷണം ചെയ്യുവാൻ തീരുമാനിച്ചവൻ ഗ്രാമങ്ങളിലെ അന്ധകാരാവൃതമായ സൗകര്യം ഉപേക്ഷിച്ച്, ആൾത്തിരക്കും വൈദ്യുതപ്രകാശവും ഉള്ള പട്ടണമദ്ധ്യത്തിലേയ്ക്കു നോക്കുവാനോ പോരുന്നതു്? ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു കാൺഗ്രസ്സ് സ്ഥാനാത്മികളെ തോൽപ്പിക്കുവാൻ വഴിപിഴച്ച ഒരാൾ വന്നിരുന്നുവെങ്കിൽ, അവരിലൊരാളെന്നും ഇവിടെ കാലുകയറുവാൻ കഴിയുമെന്ന് ഞാൻ വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു.

[Mr. K. R. Narayanan]

ക്കുന്നില്ല. അതു സംഭവിക്കാതിരിക്കട്ടെ. കാൺഗ്രസ്സുനേതാവ് പ്രാരം പ്രസംഗത്തിൽ സഹകരണം വാദാനം ചെയ്തു. ആ വാദാനം പാലി കുന്നില്ലെന്നുമാത്രമല്ല, എന്തെല്ലാം ശല്യങ്ങൾ അയഥാർത്ഥങ്ങൾ ഉന്നയിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടാക്കാമോ അതെല്ലാം ഉണ്ടാക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു.

MR. K. A. MATHEW : എന്തു ശല്യമാണ് സ്റ്റേറ്റ് കാൺഗ്രസ്സുകാർ ചെയ്യുന്നത് പറയാമോ?

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN : ബസ് ജറുപ്രസംഗം തുടങ്ങിയതുമുതൽ ഈ ശല്യത്തിന്റെ മുർച്ചയുള്ള മനകൾ ഇവിടെ പലപ്പോഴും പ്രത്യക്ഷപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഉദാഹരണമായി ഇന്നലെ വഞ്ചിപൂവർഫണ്ടിനെക്കുറിച്ചുള്ള ചോദ്യവും ഉപചോദ്യങ്ങളും മതിയാകുമല്ലോ. തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലും പറ്റത്തുള്ള ഉദാരസ്വന്തന്ത്രരുടെ സംഭാവനകൾ സ്വീകരിച്ച്, പാവങ്ങളുടെ പശിയിടക്കുവാൻ സജീവമായും ഫലപ്രദമായും നടത്തുന്ന ഒരു പ്രസ്ഥാനത്തെക്കുറിച്ചും ചോദ്യം. ഈ ചോദ്യവും അതിന്റെ ഉപചോദ്യങ്ങളും കേട്ടപ്പോൾ,

ഓ! പാപമോമൽമലരേഞ്ചത നിന്റെമേലും

ക്ഷേപിച്ചിതേ കരുണയറകരംകൃതാന്തൻ

വ്യാപാരമേ ഹനനമാം വനവേടനുണ്ടോ

വ്യാപനമായ് കഴുകുന്നെ കപോതമെന്നും.

എന്ന ഗ്ലോകം ഞാൻ സ്വയം ചൊല്ലിപ്പോയി. കപോതങ്ങളുടെ മേൽ അമ്പെയ്യുന്ന ഈ സാഹസം നിറുത്തിയാൽ കൊള്ളാം. വഞ്ചിപൂവർഫണ്ടിനു പണം എവിടെനിന്നും വരട്ടെ. ആരും സൂക്ഷിക്കട്ടെ. പ്രയോജനമുണ്ടോ എന്നുമാത്രം നോക്കിയാൽ മതിയല്ലോ. ഇതാണോ ഇന്നലെ നോക്കിയത്. സർപ്പക്കാവിൽനിന്നാകട്ടെ, ഉദ്യാനത്തിൽനിന്നാകട്ടെ, കിട്ടിയ റോസാപ്പൂവിനു പരിമളമുണ്ടോ എന്നുമാത്രം നോക്കണം. ഇങ്ങിനെ നോക്കാത്തതിനെ, നമ്മയിലും തിന്മ കാണുന്ന ഈ മനുസ്ഥിതിയെ, ശല്യമെന്നു വിവക്ഷിക്കുന്നത് തെറ്റാണോ? ഗവണ്മെൻ്റ് രാജ്യത്തിനു മേന്മയുണ്ടാകുവാൻ പലതും ചെയ്യുന്നു. നമുക്കു തെറ്റുകൾ ചൂണ്ടിക്കാണിക്കാം. നിർദ്ദേശങ്ങൾ കൊടുക്കാം. വെറും വ്യക്തിപരവും അപവാദപരവുമായ നിരൂപണത്തിനു രാജ്യത്തെയോർത്തു വിരാമമിടുക. അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്യുന്നതാണ് കർഷകർക്കും തൊഴിലാളികൾക്കും രക്ഷയെന്നു ധരിക്കുന്നത് ഗ്ലോബനിയമായിരിക്കും. ഈ അഭിപ്രായങ്ങളേടുകൂടി ഞാൻ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപം എറുക്കുന്നു.

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): The honourable member Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai has been trying today the art of winning over the goodwill and confidence both of Government and the other sections of the House. To this extent, I congratulate him, but at the same time, I am sorry for the position in which, according to me, he is now placed. He is, I am afraid, unable to extricate himself from a situation into which he has got. Left to himself, and if he had reasonable influence amongst his party, I do not think he would have allowed them to ask those questions which certainly pulled down the level of the debate which this House had been accustomed for the last several years. That is a point, Sir, which should engage the attention of the House.

There is no use of the Congress Party saying that they have come here for co-operation, but it only stands to reason that co-operation must be extended in the manner in which it ought to be extended. It should also be realised that this House certainly consists of people who can appreciate and understand co-operation when it is extended in the proper manner. Certainly there will be no churlishness on the part of anybody to refuse such co-operation if that was really extended.

Sir, years ago, one gentleman came to me a few days after the burning down of my factory and wanted me to give him a statement to be taken to Mahatma Gandhi. I did not know who he was. But he told me that he was the son-in-law of an Assistant Superintendent of Police who was in service at the time. That gentleman was very vehement in his attacks on the State Congress, on the conduct of the State Congress and on the very many iniquities that the State Congress had wrought in this country.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: May I know who that gentleman is?

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: He is one of the members of the State Congress Party in this House—Mr. K. K. Chellappan Pillai. He came to me, asked for my statement, took down facts and figures, accompanied me to have a look at my factory, had tea with me and then wanted to have all the information to tell the world how much patience the Government had exercised towards the State Congress and how much havoc was done by the State Congress and the misery that followed in the different parts of the country. Having been.....

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: Does the honourable member know that the gentleman he refers to came for enquiry into the truth of the incidents?

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: Perfectly true. He took the statement; he told me that he was convinced of the events that took place and subsequently told me after a few days that he had been able to convince Mahatma Gandhi that the Travancore State Congress was not doing the right thing and that it was engaged in committing violence. From this I trust the State Congress party would realise that many things were done for which they ought to be ashamed and for which probably the present members who are here are not responsible according to their own statements. I trust that they will not follow in the footsteps of those people.

[Mr. M. L. Janardana Pillai.]

My friend, Mr. Narayana Pillai, pointed out that in British India in eight out of the eleven Provinces—the Government did interfere in the elections. I do remember that when Mr. (now, Sir) Ramaswamy Mudaliar stood against Mr. Sathyamoorthi, the Congress did complain that all Government officers in Madras were openly canvassing for Sir Ramaswamy Mudaliar; but what happened? Mr. Sathyamoorthi came out victorious. Why so? Because the people of the country stood solidly behind the Congress. What does it show here? Mr. Gopala Pillai at Trivandrum was not able to get sufficient support from the electors to be elected to this Assembly. What does it show? It shows that the country and the electorate are not with the State Congress. It will also be realised that their claim that the whole country is behind the State Congress is not true. The sooner we realise that, the better for all concerned. If, therefore, Sir, it is the attitude on the part of the State Congress Party in this House to initiate a discussion which is derogatory to the prestige of the House, which is not in keeping with the traditions of this House and which is not for the benefit of the country at large, the House will not certainly agree with them. (President's bell).

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: In regard to the point just now raised by the honourable member about me, I request the President to give me an occasion to make a statement.

PRESIDENT: Yes, I will give you an opportunity to make an explanation.

MR. V. K. VELAYUDHAN (*Ambalapuzha cum Shertallai*). സർ, ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ മേൽ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് കൗൺസിലുകാർ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ഈ അവിശ്വാസപ്രമേയത്തെ ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി എതിർക്കുന്നു.

സർ, പൊതുജന നന്മയ്ക്കുവേണ്ടി വ്യവസായപരമായും തൊഴിൽ പരമായും മറ്റും ഗവണ്മെന്റിനോടു് സഹകരിച്ചു പ്രവർത്തിക്കാമെന്നു പ്രതിജ്ഞ ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ള ഒരു ഇലക്ഷൻ മാനിഫെസ്റ്റോ സ്റ്റേറ്റ് കൗൺസിലുകാർ നാട്ടിൽ വിതരണം ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളതു് എല്ലാ ബഹുമാന്യ മെമ്പർമാരും വായിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ഒരു കാര്യമാണ്. അതിന്നും പുറമേ ഇവർ, ജനസഞ്ചയത്തിനുള്ളിൽ കടന്ന് പ്രസംഗധോരണികളും മറ്റുംകൊണ്ടു് അവരെ മനംമയക്കി, അവരുടെ വോട്ടും സമ്പാദിച്ചു് മെമ്പർമാരായി ഇവിടെവന്നപ്പോൾ, നാട്ടുകാരുടെ നന്മയേമറന്ന്, രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ ഭക്ഷ്യ മൈശ്വര്യങ്ങളേ മറന്ന്, കൗൺസിൽ എന്നുള്ള നാമത്തിന്റെ യഥാർത്ഥമായ അർത്ഥത്തേയും തത്വത്തേയും മറന്ന്, എന്തവേണ്ട അവർ തങ്ങളുൾക്കുള്ള വ്യക്തിപരമായ നിലയെത്തന്നെയും അവഗണിച്ചു്, ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ഭോഷവശത്തെ മാത്രം എടുത്തു് കർശമായ നിരൂപണങ്ങൾ

ചെയ്യുന്നത് വെറും വ്യക്തിപരമായ വിദ്വേഷം കൊണ്ടു മത്രമല്ല എന്ന് ഞാൻ ചോദിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു. സമ്മതിദായകന്മാരുടെ മുമ്പാകെ അവർ വിതരണം ചെയ്ത പ്രകടന പത്രികയിൽ നൽകിയിരുന്ന പ്രതിജ്ഞ ഒരുവിധം, അവരുടെ പ്രവർത്തി മറൊരുവിധം!

ഇതിനകം ഏകദേശം മൂന്നുലക്ഷത്തോളം തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ പട്ടിണിപ്പാവങ്ങളുടെ ജ്വരഗ്നി ശമിപ്പിക്കാൻ കഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ള വഞ്ചി അന്ന ഭാനുപണ്ടിന്റെ ഉൽപ്പാദനം, വിശാലവീക്ഷണനും, ഔദാര്യഭാവമുള്ള അങ്ങ് നിവഹിച്ചു. അങ്ങയുടെ, കർമ്മകുശലത ഒന്നുമാത്രംകൊണ്ട് നാട്ടിനകത്തും പുറത്തുമുള്ള ഉഭയമതികളായ അനവധി മഹാമനസ്സന്മാരുടെ സഹായസഹകരണമുണ്ടായി, അത് വളന്ന് വളന്ന് തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ ഭിക്ഷുക്കളേയും പട്ടിണിപ്പാവങ്ങളേയും ഘോരപിഷ്ടിക്കത്തക്കവണ്ണം, ഒരു ശാശ്വതനിധിയെന്ന നിലയിലേക്കു ഉയർന്നു. അങ്ങയോട് അവർ ചോദിക്കുന്ന ചോദ്യങ്ങളും, ഉപചോദ്യങ്ങളും മറ്റും കേട്ടാൽ, ഇവരുടെ ഇടയിൽ എത്രോ അന്തർവാഹിനി ശക്തിയായി പ്രവഹിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെന്നുള്ളത് സ്പഷ്ടമാണ്.

സർ, രാജ്യക്ഷേമത്തെ പുലർത്തുന്നതിനേന്ന് ഭാവിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു ഇവിടെ വന്നിട്ടുള്ള സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസ്സുകാർ, തങ്ങളുടെ കടമനിറവേറുന്നതും, ഭരണാധിപനായ അങ്ങയേയും, ഭരണകൂടത്തേയും തകർക്കാനുള്ള ഉദ്യമത്തിലാണെന്നാണ് എനിക്ക് ഈ അവസരത്തിൽ പറയാനുള്ളത്. ലോകമാനവജാതിന്റെ പ്രത്യാഘാതം മൂലം നാട്ടിൽ പടർന്നു പിടിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ക്ഷാമബാധയിൽനിന്നും, എങ്ങിനെയെങ്കിലും നാട്ടുകാരെ രക്ഷിക്കണമെന്നുള്ള ത്യാഗബലിയോടുകൂടി അങ്ങ് ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ള അവിശ്വാസ പരിശ്രമം എത്രത്തോളം ജനങ്ങൾക്ക് സാഹായകമായിരുന്നു എന്ന് നാട്ടുകാർക്കും വിശിഷ്ട സ്റ്റേറ്റുകാൺഗ്രസ്സുകാർക്കും നല്ലപോലെ അറിവുള്ള ഒരു കാര്യമാണ്. അങ്ങ് രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ ശാശ്വതമായ ക്ഷേമമെശ്വര്യങ്ങൾക്കായി ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളതും തുടന്ന് പ്രവർത്തിക്കാൻ ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നതുമായ എല്ലാ മഹൽ സേവനങ്ങളേയും നാട്ടുകാർ മുക്തകണ്ഠം സ്തുതിക്കുന്നതും വിശേഷിച്ച് ഞാനും എന്റെ പാർട്ടിയും വളരെ ബഹുമാനത്തോടും കൃതജ്ഞതയോടുകൂടി സ്തുതിക്കുന്നതുമാണ്. ഇന്നത്തെ രാഷ്ട്രീയ കോലാഹലങ്ങളെല്ലാം വിസ്തൃതിയിൽ ലയിച്ച് അങ്ങ് സുരൂപംചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ള ഈ വ്യവസായിക പദ്ധതികൾ പൂർണ്ണഫലപ്രാപ്തിയിൽ എത്തി, ഒരു കാർഷികരാജ്യമായ തിരുവിതാംകൂർ ഒരു വ്യവസായിക രാജ്യമെന്ന അവസ്ഥതിലേക്കു പരിവർത്തനം ചെയ്യപ്പെടുമ്പോൾ

[Mr. V. K. Velayudhan.]

ഭാവിതലമുറക്കൾ അങ്ങയുടെ സേവനങ്ങളെ കൃതജ്ഞതാപരസ്സരം സ്മരിക്കുമെന്നുള്ളതിൽ എനിക്കു യാതൊരു സംശയവുമില്ല. ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി എതിർക്കുന്നു.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: In view of the statement made by Mr. Janardana Pillai, I have to make this observation.

Sir, I have been a devotee of the Indian National Congress for long, and have been a devotee of non-violence in its entirety in relation to political fight and political agitation. Of course, when the State Congress began its movements here, I was not sure whether the country was prepared to undertake the trials which the Civil Disobedience Movement involved. It was started, so to say, wisely or unwisely, at the time. The repression by the Police soon followed and we had many repercussions.

PRESIDENT: The honourable member cannot go into political chronicling. He can give only a personal explanation.

MR. K. K. CHELLAPPAN PILLAI: Because I was justly convinced that I should do something in the matter and it is because I wanted to represent to Gandhiji that it was not time for them to start the Civil Disobedience Movement a second time that I went to him and represented matters to him. That is a fact. Later there were people who deserted the Party, but under the leadership of Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai, the Party is really making progress on the lines of 'Ahimsa'.

PRESIDENT: Order, order. The House will now adjourn and meet again at 3 p. m.

The House reassembled at 3 p. m.

PRESIDENT: We have 15 minutes more for the close of the debate and as the names of one or two official members have been mentioned during the course of the debate, in equity for them, I should give them an opportunity to speak.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Legal Remembrancer to Government*): Sir, let me at the outset thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this occasion. Let me also thank the House and ask them to hear patiently what I have got to say on the matter. The first thing I want to say, Sir, is this. Since I am only a part time officer, the Government have conceded to me all the privileges of a non-official and I sought for it and I got it for the simple reason that the allowance that the Government gives me is hardly sufficient for me to keep that level of comfort and ease which I have been accustomed to these long years. Still, Sir, in this election I should not have taken any part but for two very fundamental reasons. The first reason is this. I have no quarrel with the members of the State Congress party, particularly the younger members who are here and who are probably honest in their convictions. But, Sir, I expect them to concede to others this same liberty of thought and action, this same liberty for convictions and I say, Sir, with the utmost conviction,

that, I for one, do not accept the principle, or the policy, of the State Congress. I do not think, Sir, that loyalty to the Sovereign is a sin. I do not think, Sir, that support to the Government of the day is a sin. Therefore, I say, that notwithstanding.....

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Has the State Congress ever said that loyalty to the Sovereign is a sin?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: It has said, Sir.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Where is it?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: I have no time now. But if the honourable member would meet me this evening, I will give him facts and figures on the matter.

Again, Sir, I have no quarrel with them. I say, Sir, whatever may be the fact in 1943, I was living in fear of my life in the years, 1938, 1939, 1940 and 1941 and I am not a coward. I have faced a crowd; I have faced audiences. Sir, my next door neighbour, a police constable, was murdered. Himself and family and children were living next to my house. The policeman was my class mate. His wife and children are today in the street. I ask, Sir, who is responsible for this ghastly murder?

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Then, why is it that the State Congress was not declared an illegal organisation.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: I am not responsible for that. If I were the Head of the Government, I would have declared them illegal.

PRESIDENT: Hypothetical question do not arise.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Sir, may I know...

PRESIDENT: It is up to the member to say what his views are; but hypothetical statements uttered by the member need not be depended upon.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: If the same God that the Honourable member for Neyyattinkara invoked awhile ago were to consider this question of violence, that question will be decided much to the unpleasantness and discomfiture of the State Congress. I was speaking about the dead body and I charge the State Congress as responsible for that. I ask, who is responsible for the cold-blooded murder of Kunjakrishna Pillai, the policeman referred to. That is the second point. Thirdly, I supported Mr. Lakshmana Iyer's candidature for another reason. Mr. Lakshmana Iyer himself stated that on the floor of the House.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: One question, Sir.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, I do not yield. Mr. Lakshmana Iyer stood for election in the city of Trivandrum as early as 1102 or so. I had the misfortune—I confess—then to join hands against Mr. Lakshmana Iyer on a communal ticket. Ever since that time, I have been sorry for that. Trivandrum city is the only town where a representative of the minority community like a Brahmin could ever hope to stand for an election.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: One question, Sir.

PRESIDENT: The Chief Secretary will now speak.

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: Sir, I do not wish to import into the debate the heat and rhetoric which were indulged in by some of my honourable friends on the other side of the House. One is perplexed as to the real stand taken on the other side by my honourable friends of the State Congress party in regard to the object of the motion and their attitude towards the Government. Sir, it is a case of two alternating impulses, whether to co-operate or not to co-operate. At one moment one feels as if they were anxious to co-operate; the next moment, the whole atmosphere changes. It looks as if they were not sure of their own mind.

Sir, they have concentrated on two points; one is on the attitude of Government towards the State congress organisation as indicated in the statement made by you and the other is about this alleged interference of Government officers in the recent elections. As regards the first, I do not wish to rake up old history, especially as the matter has been dealt with on the floor of the House by previous speakers. Those incidents and tragedies still remain fresh in our minds. It was suggested that there might have been some insignificant members of the State Congress in that episode. May I however ask in all humility, whether Mr. U. Kesavan, and others who were convicted in connection with these incidents can be regarded as insignificant members. Further Sir, I desire to refer the honourable members to the debate which took place on the floor of this House in those days, when these occurrences actually took place. We find that the Dewan had made the following statement then:

"It is a libel on the Government to suggest that the Government have had anything to do, directly, indirectly, proximately or otherwise, with any disturbance at any meeting. Such things have been stated outside the State for purposes into which I need not enter. More atrocious libels upon the people in the State, upon the Government of the State, upon the finances of the State and upon the conduct of the persons in charge of the Government of the State have been uttered than have been heard in India for a very long time, or then could be thought possible in our country and it is not my purpose to deal with those matters now."....."

He added,

"With the fullest sense of responsibility and having regard to the activities of the Congress party, I, as a member and the Head of the Government of Travancore say that, that party has been pursuing disloyal and subversive activities....."

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Sir, was that statement accepted by the State Congress party?

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: Sir, that statement was accepted by a thumping majority of 49 representatives of the people in this Assembly.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Anyway, it was not by the State Congress.

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: I was saying that this House, a very responsible body, then endorsed that statement.

Again, Sir, recently, the President of the State Congress, Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai wrote to Government about the removal of disqualifications to stand as candidates for the Legislature and the correspondence relating thereto has already been published. In that connection the Dewan observed:

"This Government have, on many occasions, declared that the Travancore State Congress must be held to be responsible for and has never dissociated itself from the subversive agitation that was encouraged and conducted by prominent members of that body several of whom were sentenced to imprisonment by the courts. Government have also pointed out that the agitation was revolutionary in character and inevitably led to widespread and serious violence to person and property resulting in murders, grave assaults, incendiarism, destruction of public buildings and of bridges and culverts with a view to break down communications and many other acts of sabotage....."

Now, Sir, this was put into the hands of the President of the State Congress in March 1944 and it was widely published in all the papers. That was the background in which the election campaign was conducted in the country. How can it be suggested that the terrible defeat which the State Congress candidate sustained by a difference of 3000 votes was due to the result of interference on the part of Government officials.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Sir, may I know—

RAJYASEVAPRAVINA G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: Sir, let me conclude my speech and questions may be asked towards the end. Sir, it has been stated in the correspondence which has passed between the State Congress President and the Dewan that the Chief Secretary himself "is said to have" exerted his influence in favour... and given directions to his subordinates. Now I ask is that the sort of statement which should be made by a responsible body like the State Congress. In the second letter also the same vague and baseless statement was made and when it came to the third letter, prominent mention was made of the Chief Secretary, the Director of Public Instruction and the Excise Commissioner. I have already repudiated these allegations as entirely unfounded.

PRESIDENT: The time for the demand having lapsed, this motion has to be voted upon by the House. It is a vote of no-confidence.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: A word of explanation, Sir. I want to make it clear once more that my party does not regard this vote as one of no-confidence on Government.

PRESIDENT: The Government does. This motion is either a vote of confidence or want of confidence in the Government.

It is the privilege of all Governments to treat the voting on any debate or cut motion as indicative of confidence in the Government or the reverse as the case may be. In this matter Government have decided to treat the cut motion as a vote of want of confidence in this Government.

The motion was put to vote and declared lost.

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: Sir, I demand a poll. A poll was taken with the following result:

AYES—11.

1 Mr. K. K. Chellappan Pillai	7 Mr. S. Sankaranarayanan
2 „ V. I. Idicula	8 „ A. P. Udayabhannu
3 „ K. A. Mathew	9 „ K. Varughese Ithac
4 „ K. T. Michael	10 „ P. M. Varghese
5 „ T. K. Narayana Pillai	11 „ Xavier Vincent
6 „ P. S. Nataraja Pillai	

NOES—52.

1 Mr. P. C. Adichan	28 Rajyasevanirata K. G. Parameswaran Pillai
2 „ P. R. Atchuthan	29 Mr. G. Parameswaran Pillai
3 „ K. Balakrishna Menon	30 „ K. M. Paul
4 „ A. K. Bhaskar	31 „ J. E. A. Pereira
5 „ M. K. Chandrasekhara	32 „ M. R. Ramakrishna Pillai
6 Rajyasevanirata S. Chathanatha Karayalar	33 „ C. K. Sankara Pillai
7 Mr. V. Gangadharan Nair	34 „ V. Sreedharan Pillai
8 „ M. L. Janardhana Pillai	35 „ K. Sukumaran
9 „ K. C. Karunakaran	36 „ A. R. Sulaiman Sait
10 „ K. G. Kesavan Nair	37 „ S. Thiraviam Nadar
11 „ T. T. Kesavan Sastri.	38 „ J. W. Tolson
12 „ S. Krishna Aiyar	39 „ V. K. Velappan Nair
13 „ V. S. Krishna Pillai	40 „ V. K. Velayudhan
14 „ P. K. Kumaran	41 „ Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhan Pillai
15 „ P. K. Kunju	42 „ Brahmapuram P. Yesudian
16 „ C. S. Lakshmana Aiyar	43 „ P. G. Narayanan Unniathan
17 „ V. Madhavan	44 „ A. Gopala Menon
18 „ Varkala K. Madhavan	45 „ I. C. Chacko
19 „ B. Madhavan Nair	46 „ S. Parthasarathi Aiyangar
20 Sahib Bahadur K. A. Mohamed	47 „ K. R. Narayana Aiyar
21 Mr. M. K. Mohamed	48 Rajyasevapravina G. Parameswaran Pillai
22 „ P. S. Mohamed	49 Rajyasevapravina K. P. Padmanabha Menon
23 „ K. R. Narayanan	50 Mr. K. G. Kujukrishna Pillai
24 Sry. T. Narayani Amma	51 „ S. Narayana Aiyar
25 Mr. A. Nesamony	52 „ G. Narayanan Tampi
26 „ M. K. Nilakantan	
27 „ N. D. Parameswaran Namboodiri	

NEUTRALS—7.

1 Mr. Chazhikattu Joseph	5 Mr. S. Muthukaruppa Pillai
2 „ P. K. Kuriakose	6 „ D. Thomas
3 „ E. K. Madhavan	7 „ P. O. Thomas.
4 „ J. T. Morais	

The motion was declared lost, eleven voting for, fifty two voting against and seven remaining neutral.

The question that a sum of Rs. 4,49,855 be granted under Demand IV was put and carried.

The Demand was passed and the grant was made.